

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed June 17, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 6, 7 – 13, 20 – 22 and 24 – 28 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have added claims 27 – 28, have amended claims 1 and 20, and have canceled claims 6 and 23 (claims 14 – 19 having been canceled previously) without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer.

Applicants have canceled claims 6 and 23 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action indicates that claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 because “said optical imaging device” lacks antecedent basis. As set forth above, Applicants have amended claim 20 and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Since there are no other substantive rejections of claim 20, Applicants respectfully assert that removal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 places this claim in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rasansky*. With respect to claim 6, Applicants have canceled this claim and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been

rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In this regard, *Rasansky* involves a scheduling system for use between users on the Worldwide Web. Specifically, *Rasansky* discloses:

In still further preferred embodiments, computer systems for scheduling events between end users provided in accordance with the invention solve the aforementioned problems and long-felt needs. Preferably, ***theses systems comprise a client interface that allows an initial end user to communicate a desire to schedule and event through the system to potential end users.*** Still more preferably, the systems comprise a transport medium interface for allowing the system to transport proposed event schedules between potential end users of the system. Yet more preferably, ***the systems comprise a computer subsystem for generating for the initial end user of the system, a calendar that is adapted to contain the events for that initial client and which is modifiable when other end users of the system, or that first user places messages about events into the calendar of the initial user.***

Methods for scheduling events also satisfy the above referenced long-felt needs. Preferably the methods comprise the steps of allowing an initial end user to communicate events to other potential end users or to himself, delivering the events from the initial end user to the other potential end users, or to the initial end user, with a standard protocol, and confirming the events in a visible manner to both the initial end user, and other potential end users.

(*Rasansky* at column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 21). (Emphasis added).

Based on the representative teachings of *Rasansky* above, *Rasansky* only enables users of the system to exchange calendar information. That is, if calendar information is available, but not somehow registered with the system of *Rasansky* for use, that calendar information is not provided.

This aspect of *Rasansky* is further specified in the following teachings:

In accordance with the invention, in order to set up a calendar with the system of FIGS. 1A-1E, the end user first establishes an account with Appointnet because that end user wishes to set up appointments with one or more individuals. This end user then is given a private personal calendar by the Appointnet system. The end user may create an ASG with the Appointnet system. ***This ASG is then published and made available to other users of the Appointnet***

system. While creating this ASG that end user may specify which other end users may see that ASG. Those end users are then notified by the Appointnet system that the ASG is available to them. The calendar is delivered through the Internet using standard Internet Protocols to the client [20] as HTML, and viewed by the end user(s). (Rasansky at column 9, line 59 – column 10, line 5). (Emphasis added).

Notably, an “ASG” is defined by Rasansky in the following passage:

These events are typically appointments on the first end user's Active Scheduling Grid (ASG), sometimes referred to simply as a scheduling grid or calendar.
(Rasansky at column 4, lines 47 - 49).

Thus, calendar information is only distributed among specified end users that are identified to Rasansky's system. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants' claims.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A system for collecting calendar information from a predetermined calendar source and distributing calendar data to a subscriber, said system comprising:
 - an input device configured to capture calendar data from a subscriber-designated calendar source;
 - a collection and distribution unit communicatively coupled to the input device and a network via a network interface, the collection and distribution unit comprising a storage memory for storing a subscriber list and configured to integrate calendar data from the input device into a calendar database; and
 - a subscriber unit indirectly coupled and registered with the collection and distribution unit, the subscriber unit configured to receive calendar data from the collection and distribution unit in accordance with said subscriber list;

wherein the input device is operative to capture calendar data from the subscriber-designated calendar source responsive to identifying the subscriber-designated calendar source from the subscriber list such that the calendar data is captured without the calendar data being designated with the collection and distribution unit for distribution to the subscriber unit.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that Rasansky is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that Rasansky does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above

in claim 1. That is, the system of *Rasansky* only captures calendar data if that calendar data is designated for distribution, i.e., the end user possessing that calendar data is registered with *Rasansky's* system. In contrast, Applicants have claimed an invention that operates without such restriction as recited above. These features are fully supported by the disclosure, such as at FIG. 4B and page 9, lines 14 – 22, wherein the subscriber record is accessed for determining which calendar sources are to be used for capturing calendar data. Clearly, in the given example, the calendar source of www.highschool.edu is not an end user Applicants' system as required by *Rasansky*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Since claims 2 – 5, 21 and 22 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action indicates that claims 7-13 and 21 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rasansky* further in view of *Williams*. With respect to claim 6, Applicants have canceled this claim and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In this regard, the Office Action indicates that *Rasansky* does not indicate that an input device as recite in Applicants' claims can be an optical imaging device. Applicants respectfully agree with this limited contention. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the contention that *Williams* discloses such a use.

In this regard, the Office Action refers to the following:

With reference now to the Figures, and in particular with reference to FIG. 1, there is shown, in block diagram form, an apparatus according to the present invention. The apparatus includes a data processing system 100. The data processing system 100 includes a processor 102, which includes a central processing unit (CPU) 104 and memory 106. Additional memory, such as a hard disk file storage 108 and a floppy disk device 110 may be connected to the processor 102. Floppy disk device 110 may write to or read from a removable diskette 112 which may have computer program code recorded thereon that implements portions of the present invention in the data processing system 100. Inputs may also be received from a fax/modem 114, which is connected to a telephone line 116, and from a microphone 124. ***The data processing system 100 also includes user interface hardware, such as a mouse 120 a keyboard 122 and a scanner 118, for the allowing user input to the processor 102.*** The data processing system 100 also includes visual display devices, such as monochrome or color display monitor 126 and a printer 128, for rendering visual information. The data processing system may also include an audio output device, such as speaker 130 for rendering audio information. A telephone 132 may be connected to the telephone line 116 through the fa/modem 114.

(*Williams* at column 2, line 47 – column 3, line 3). (Emphasis added).

The above passage is the only mention of the use of a scanner in *Williams*.

Since, *Williams* involves the use of a computer, such a teaching amounts to nothing more than general knowledge that a computer can use a scanner as an input device.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion within *Williams* for using the scanner and a collection and distribution unit in the manner recited in Applicants claims.

In this regard, claim 7 recites:

7. A system for collecting calendar information from a predetermined calendar source and distributing calendar data to a subscriber, said system comprising:
 - an optical imaging device configured to capture an image of calendar data;***
 - a collection and distribution unit*** communicatively coupled to the optical imaging device and a network via a network interface, the collection and distribution unit comprising a storage memory for storing a subscriber list and ***configured to integrate calendar data from the image of calendar data into a native format of a calendar database;*** and
 - a subscriber unit registered with the collection and distribution unit and configured to receive calendar data from the collection and

distribution via said network interface in accordance with said subscriber list.
(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the cited art is legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 7 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Rasansky* and *Williams*, either individually or in combination, do not teach reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 7. That is, none of the cited references teaches or reasonably suggests a system in which an optical imaging device captures an image of calendar data and a collection and distribution unit integrates calendar data from the image of calendar data into a native format of a calendar database. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Since claims 8 – 13, 20 and 24 - 26 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 7, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Newly Added Claims

As identified above, claims 27 and 28 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reason that these claims are dependent claims that incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims, the allowability of each of which is described above.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Jr.
Registration No. 43,024